

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated November 23, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this Response, claim 19 has been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 19-21 are pending in the application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the above amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,894,136, issued to Wook (hereafter “Wook”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,043,511, issued to Kim (hereafter “Kim”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because neither Wook nor Kim, analyzed alone or in any combination, teaches or suggests the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. In particular, Wook and Kim fail to teach or suggest an array substrate for an active matrix type liquid crystal display (LCD) device “wherein an end portion of the semiconductor layer under the data line is substantially a same width as an end portion of the data line” as recited in independent claim 19 of the present application.

In Wook, “the high concentration n-type amorphous silicon layer 8 and amorphous silicon layer 7 under the data line are formed wider than the data line” (col. 4, lines 44-47, see FIG. 7E). And, Kim discloses a device “wherein the semiconductor layer has the same dimensions and pattern as the passivation layer” (see, claim 1). As such, neither Wook nor Kim teach “an end portion of the semiconductor layer under the data line is substantially a same width as an end portion of the data line” as recited in independent claim 19.

Because Wook and Kim fail to teach the above feature of independent claim 19, claim 19 and its dependent claim 20 are allowable over any combination of Wook and Kim. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wook and Kim in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,926,235, issued to Han et al. (hereafter “Han”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because neither Wook, Kim nor Han, analyzed alone or in any combination, teaches or suggests the combined features recited in

Response dated February 21, 2006

Reply to Office Action dated November 23, 2005

the claims of the present application. In particular, Wook, Kim and Han fail to teach an array substrate for an active matrix type liquid crystal display (LCD) device “wherein an end portion of the semiconductor layer under the data line is substantially a same width as an end portion of the data line” as recited in independent claim 19, from which claim 21 depends.

Applicants have discussed above the deficient teachings of Wook and Kim, and submit Han fails to remedy the deficient teachings of Wook and Kim such that any combination of Wook, Kim and Han would provide a device having the combined features recited in independent claim 19. Han discloses an active matrix liquid crystal display. However, Han does not disclose “an end portion of the semiconductor layer under the data line is substantially a same width as an end portion of the data line”. Because Han does not teach this feature of independent claim 19, Han does not remedy the deficient teachings of Wook and Kim. Accordingly, no combination of Wook, Kim and Han would provide a device having at least this feature of independent claim 19. As such, claim 19 and its dependent claim 21 are allowable over Wook, Kim and Han.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

Response dated February 21, 2006

Reply to Office Action dated November 23, 2005

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: February 21, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes

Valerie P. Hayes

Registration No.: 53,005

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant